

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/748,903		12/30/2003	Myoung-Ho Jung	8836-221 (IE13077-US)	7410
22150	7590	03/30/2006		EXAMINER	
		CIATES, LLC	WEBB, GREGORY E		
130 WOODBURY ROAD WOODBURY, NY 11797				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1751	
				DATE MAILED: 03/30/2000	DATE MAILED: 03/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/748,903	JUNG ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Gregory E. Webb	1751				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DESTRICTION OF THE MAILING DESTRUCTION OF THE MAILING	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC .136(a). In no event, however, may a red d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON [*] tte, cause the application to become ABA	CATION. sply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 i	February 2006.	•				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This						
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application	n.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	1					
8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ac	cepted or b) objected to be	by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	-					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documer						
2. Certified copies of the priority documer	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
 Copies of the certified copies of the pri- application from the International Burea 	•	received in this National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	received.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)				
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	- ·				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/748,903

Art Unit: 1751

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1-8, drawn to composition for cleaning semiconductors, classified in class
 510, subclass 175.
 - II. Claims 9-16, drawn to method of cleaning silaceous substrates, classified in class134, subclass 3.
 - III. Claim 17, drawn to apparatus for cleaning containing tubular fluid flow, classified in class 15, subclass 3.5.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the cleaning composition could be used in processes beyond those described in group II. For example the composition could be used for etching metals.
- 3. Inventions II and III are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the method does not specifically require the apparatus of claim 17. For example the method of group II

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/748,903

Art Unit: 1751

could be practiced in a simple soak tank which would not require the pump agitation of the apparatus of group III.

- 4. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 5. A telephone call was made to Mark Hanley on 3/27/06 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 10/748,903

Art Unit: 1751

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory E. Webb whose telephone number is 571-272-1325.

The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-17:30 (m-f).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglass McGinty can be reached on (571)272-1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory E. Webb Primary Examiner Art Unit 1751

gew